

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-8 are currently pending and under consideration in the application. Claim 1 has been amended.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants have amended claim 1. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4, and 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,524 (Ecker) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,010,486 (Suzuki).

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged that Ecker does not disclose a replacing means for generating a pattern of a predetermined translated sentence corresponding to the string of the conceptual categories, as in the present invention. The Examiner, however, alleges that Suzuki discloses the replacing means of the present invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that in contrast to the present invention, Suzuki's replacing means simply replaces an equivalent *word* contained in a translated sentence by another desired equivalent word contained in a dictionary. See Suzuki, column 3, lines 9-16. See *also* claim 1.

Simply replacing a word is not tantamount to or related to replacing a *pattern of a predetermined translated sentence* with translated words corresponding to original morphemes of conceptual categories, as a word is not a pattern of a predetermined translated sentence. Moreover, in contrast to the present invention in which the replacement occurs when the string of predetermined typical conceptual categories is determined to exist, in Suzuki, the replacement is not based on whether a string of predetermined typical conceptual categories is determined to exist.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 are patentable over the references. As dependent claims 3 and 6 depend from independent claims 1 and 4, respectively, the dependent claims are patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented for the independent claims.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 3-9-07

By:   
Reginald D. Lucas  
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501